



Department of Planning, Housing, & Community Development

Mayor, Richard C. David
Director, Jennie Skeadas-Sherry

STAFF REPORT

TO: Planning Commission Members
FROM: Planning Housing and Community Development
DATE: June 27, 2014
SUBJECT: 247 Robinson Street; Series A Site Plan Review
TAX ID #: 145.77-3-16 and 145.78-1-30
CASE: 2014-30

A. REVIEW REQUESTED

This request would provide for the establishment of a neighborhood retail convenience outlet within an existing 2,520 square foot one-story commercial building. The proposed store, which would offer grocery and convenience items, would operate 7 days a week between the hours of 6:00am -10:00pm. The applicant approximates that 200 customers would visit the site daily. Two employees are proposed.

The site is located within the C-4 Neighborhood Commercial District. The site was previously occupied by a US Post Office. While a neighborhood retail convenience outlet is a permitted use in the C-4 District, Site Plan approval is required.

B. STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF SITE PLANS

Listed below are the *Standards for approval of site plans* found in Article IX of the Zoning Ordinance. In reviewing a Series A Site Plan application, the Planning Commission is guided by the existing characteristics and conditions of the site, its surroundings, and the particular requirements of the Applicant. Elements of concern include, but are not limited to the following:

- Movement of vehicles and people
- Public safety
- Off-street parking and service
- Lot size, density, setbacks, building size, coverage and height
- Landscaping, site drainage, buffering, views or visual character
- Signs, site lighting
- Operational characteristics
- Architectural features, materials and colors
- Compatibility with general character of neighborhood
- Other considerations that may reasonably be related to health, safety, and general welfare

B. SITE PLAN COMMENTS

Currently, almost the entire frontage of the site along Robinson Street has an open curb cut where 5 parking spaces back out into the street. The proposed site plan would reduce the curb opening along Robinson to 24 feet and reorient the parking such that the maneuvering aisle is located on the site and not in the street. Further, the proposed site plan illustrates the removal of asphalt and the restoration of grass within the utility strips. Staff recommends that the applicant request street trees from the City's Parks Department. Overall, the proposed site plan would result in fewer conflicts between vehicles entering and exiting the site and those travelling along Robinson Street and would improve infiltration and aesthetics within the public right of way.

The following issues were identified and should be addressed by the applicant:

The proposed accessible parking space proposed at the east side of the building does not technically meet requirements because the accessibility aisle includes to the sidewalk. Staff recommends that the accessible space be relocated to the space immediate adjacent to the south side (front) of the building and the adjacent space be striped as the accessibility aisle.

The site plan and submitted case materials do not include provisions for trash storage or a trash management plan. If a dumpster is proposed or deemed necessary by the Commission, the site plan should be revised to illustrate the dumpster location and enclosure consistent with Zoning Code Section 410-56.

The site plan and submitted case materials do not include provisions for exterior lighting. At a minimum, wall pack lights along the building façade should be installed to illuminate the parking area.

C. SITE REVIEW

The subject property is located at the north east corner of Robinson and Bigelow Streets. It is improved with a one-story commercial building. It is adjoined by residential structures to the west and north, a mixed use building to the east and a church to the south.

D. PREVIOUS ZONING BOARD & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIVITY

206 Robinson Street – On August 29, 2014 a Determination of No Historical Significance from the Commission on Architecture and Urban Design (CAUD) was issued to allow the demolition of a residential building located on the site. A Series A Site Plan applicant for a new parking lot is currently pending before the Planning Commission

278 Robinson Street – On March 19, 2008 the Planning Commission approved a Special Use Permit, Series A Site Plan Review, to build a 1260 square foot addition to the existing Lourdes Primary Care and Walk-In in a C-4, Neighborhood Commercial District

E. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

The applicant's proposal is a SEQR **Unlisted** Action. The Zoning Board should be the lead agency to determine any environmental significance related to the use and area variances.

1. Motion to determine what type of action:

- a. Type I
 - b. Type II
 - c. **Unlisted**
2. Determine Lead Agency and other involved agencies.
3. After the Public Hearing, Determination of Significance. The Planning Commission is responsible for completing Part 2 & Part 3 of the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF)– see below.

SEQR EAF Part 2 - Impact Assessment. The Lead Agency (ZBA) is responsible for the completion of Part 2. Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the ZBA. When answering the questions the ZBA should be guided by the concept “Have our responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?”

	NO, OR SMALL IMPACT MAY OCCUR	MODERATE TO LARGE IMPACT MAY OCCUR
Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?		
Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?		
Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?		
Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?		
Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?		
Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?		
Will the proposed action impact existing: A. public / private water supplies? B. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?		
Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?		
Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?		
Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage Problems?		
Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?		

EAF Part 3 - Determination of significance. For every question in Part 2 that answered “moderate to large impact may occur”, or if there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact, please complete Part 3. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or design elements that have been included by

the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts. Part 3 should also explain how the lead agency determined that the impact may or will not be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed considering its setting, probability of occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the potential for short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts.

- If the Planning Commission determines that the proposed action may result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts an environmental impact statement is required.
- The Planning Commission may issue a Negative Declaration if it is determined that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

F. STAFF FINDINGS

Planning Staff has the following findings:

- 1) The Planning Commission must determine if the requirements of Section 410-47 for a Series A Site Plan Review have been met.

J. ENCLOSURES

Enclosed is a copy of the site plan, site photographs and application.